

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

20 December 2017

Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Franke, Peter M. and Huntley, Brian and Parnell, Andrew C. (2018) 'Frequency selection in palaeoclimate time series : a model-based approach incorporating possible time uncertainty.', *Environmetrics.*, 29 (2). e2492.

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://doi.org/10.1002/env.2492>

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is the accepted version of the following article: Franke, Peter M., Huntley, Brian Parnell, Andrew C. (2018). Frequency selection in palaeoclimate time series: a model-based approach incorporating possible time uncertainty. *Environmetrics*, 29(2): e2492, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1002/env.2492>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance With Wiley Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

Additional information:

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

Frequency selection in palaeoclimate time series: a model-based approach incorporating possible time uncertainty

Peter M. Franke¹, Brian Huntley² and Andrew C. Parnell³

¹School of Mathematics and Statistics, University College Dublin, County Dublin, Republic of Ireland

²School of Biological and Biomedical Sciences, Durham University, County Durham, United Kingdom

³School of Mathematics and Statistics, University College Dublin, County Dublin, Republic of Ireland

³Insight Centre for Data Analytics, University College Dublin, County Dublin, Republic of Ireland

Corresponding author: Mr P.M. Franke, School of Mathematics and Statistics, University College Dublin, Dublin 4, Belfield, Republic of Ireland. Email: peter.m.franke@gmail.com

December 17, 2017

Abstract

A key aspect of palaeoclimate time series analysis is the identification of frequency behaviour. Commonly this is achieved by calculating a power spectrum and comparing this spectrum with that of a simplified model. Traditional hypothesis testing method can then be used to find statistically significant peaks which correspond to different frequencies. Complications occur when the data are multivariate, or suffer from time uncertainty. In particular, the presence of joint uncertainties surrounding observations and their timing makes traditional hypothesis testing impractical.

In this paper we re-express the frequency identification problem in the time domain as a variable selection model where each variable corresponds to a different frequency. We place this problem in a Bayesian framework that allows us to place shrinkage prior distributions on the weighting of each frequency, as well as include informative prior information through which we can take account of time uncertainty.

We validate our approach with simulated data and illustrate it with analysis of mid- to late- Holocene water table records from two sites in Northern Ireland - Dead Island and Slieveanorra. Both case studies also show the extent of the challenges that may face researchers. We therefore present one case that shows a good model fit with a clear frequency pattern and the other case where the identification of frequency behaviour is impossible. We contrast our results with that of the extant methodology, known as REDFIT.

Keywords: frequency analysis, time uncertainty, parameter selection, REDFIT

1 Introduction

Frequency analysis of cyclic and quasi-cyclic dynamics in palaeoclimate time series plays a vital role in identifying the causes of palaeoclimatic variations, and thus in disentangling the mechanisms underlying processes of these variations. Identifying frequencies characteristic of solar activity, variations in the Earth's and lunar orbits, in palaeoclimate time series has led to the recognition of the importance of at least orbital variability and solar variability as drivers of global climatic changes. The primary example is the demonstration of the orbital frequencies in Quaternary palaeoclimatic time series that span multiple glacial-interglacial cycles (Hays, Imbrie, & Shackleton, 1976). Another example is the identification of solar activity periodicities in the record of last glacial climatic variability (Bond et al., 1997). Warner and Domack (2002) identify frequencies in their palaeoclimate time series from Antarctica that correspond to solar variability and lunar orbital periodicities.

In this paper we introduce a new method to identify frequency behaviour whilst dealing with time irregularity and uncertainty. The most commonly used methods in the assessment of frequency patterns are based on Fourier methods which rely on a discretely-observed, evenly-spaced time variable. In the case where data are continuous in time and unevenly spaced, Lomb-Scargle methods are often used (Lomb, 1976; Scargle, 1982, 1989). However, in palaeoclimate time series, data are not only irregularly spaced but also often observed with known time uncertainty.

A commonly-used package for dealing with frequency analysis of irregular data is that of REDFIT (Mudelsee, 2009; Schulz & Mudelsee, 2002). This method involves calculating an empirical Lomb-Scargle periodogram for the time series in question, and then comparing this empirical periodogram with quantiles of the theoretical periodogram of an AR(1)

process (Schulz & Mudelsee, 2002). At frequency levels where the empirical periodogram is larger than that of the theoretical quantiles, the frequency is adjudged to have attained 'statistical significance'. A number of issues with this model persist:

- To take account of time uncertainty, a number of bootstrap simulations are required to re-sample the time series. This is computationally expensive;
- Since the empirical periodogram is only compared against that of an AR(1), other models that may be preferable are ignored;
- Care needs to be taken when choosing the number of frequencies to test, since this will increase the probability of a type 1 error in the hypothesis test;
- The statistical significance framework provides that all null hypotheses will be rejected if the data set is large enough. This will lead to the over-estimation of the number of important frequencies.

In our approach, we re-express the frequency analysis problem as that of a Bayesian variable selection in the time domain, where we explore a large class of model behaviour exhibiting both frequency and non-frequency patterns, and allow the data to choose between them through the model fitting process. Our method allows for time uncertainty to be naturally incorporated as part of the Bayesian prior distribution, and we have explicit probabilities of frequencies being included in the model.

Temporal uncertainty arises because it is impossible to obtain the exact age of each layer in a fossil core. Ages of certain layers can be obtained through, e.g. radiocarbon dating, but these are uncertain due to both laboratory measurement error and the uncertainty associated with calibrating the laboratory measurement into calendar years. This uncertainty is further compounded because other layers also need dating, and so an interpolation strategy is required. We use Bchron (Haslett & Parnell, 2008; Parnell & Gehrels, 2015) which provides ages and standard errors for the timing of each data point.

Our paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we discuss how frequency analysis has

traditionally been performed with palaeoclimate time series. In Section 3 we outline our new approach and introduce all notation. In Section 4 we provide a simple simulated example and show this outperforms REDFIT at identifying frequencies. In Section 5 we apply our new models to water table time series from two sites in Northern Ireland - Dead Island and Slieveanorra. We conclude and suggest avenues for further research in Section 6.

2 Traditional Approach to Frequency Identification

A discretely sampled time series can be decomposed into a constant, non-cyclical trend function and a sum of cyclical components via the following form:

$$y(t_i) = g(t_i) + \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j \cos(2\pi f_j t_i) + \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_j \sin(2\pi f_j t_i) + \xi_i \quad (1)$$

Here:

- $y(t_i)$ is a univariate observation (e.g. water table records, transformed pollen counts etc.) sampled at time t_i ;
- t_i represents the continuous time of the i^{th} observation;
- $g(t_i)$ is a non-cyclical trend function of known form usually also containing a constant term;
- k is the number of frequency components;
- f_j is the frequency for component j ;
- β_j and γ_j represent the Fourier coefficients of cosine and sine functions at the j^{th} frequency;
- ξ_i is the residual error term, commonly assumed normally distributed $\xi_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$.

The power spectral density $P(f)$ is obtained based on the estimated coefficients of the cyclical components β and γ in Equation 1 as follows:

$$P(f_j) = \frac{\beta_j^2 + \gamma_j^2}{2} \quad (2)$$

In general obtaining power spectral densities can be achieved either directly from the data without applying any intermediate steps (e.g. Fast Fourier Transform) or indirectly, which requires estimating Fourier coefficients β and γ from a version of Equation 1 in the first step, and obtaining power spectra afterwards - Equation 2.

Below we present a few of the most relevant methods of frequency analysis and discuss their applicability in the analysis of irregular and uncertain time series. We discuss the main features of the traditional methods to estimate frequency behaviour in the context of the general decomposition function presented in Equation 1. We use the notation of Equation 1 for the majority of the paper.

2.1 Spectra of the frequency domain method applicable to unevenly spaced time series

The Lomb-Scargle method (Lomb, 1976; Scargle, 1982, 1989) is a transformation of Equation 1 with exclusion of the same elements as in the case of the Discrete Fourier Transform. It is a direct method of frequency analysis that evaluates spectra at angular frequencies $\omega_k = 2\pi f_k > 0$. It also incorporates an adjustment term κ to account for possible irregular timing of observations. The Lomb-Scargle power spectrum is defined as:

$$P(\omega_k) = \frac{1}{2\sigma_y^2} \left\{ \frac{\left[\sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \bar{y}) \cos \omega_k(t_i - \kappa) \right]^2}{\sum_{i=1}^N \cos^2 \omega_k(t_i - \kappa)} + \frac{\left[\sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \bar{y}) \sin \omega_k(t_i - \kappa) \right]^2}{\sum_{i=1}^N \sin^2 \omega_k(t_i - \kappa)} \right\}, \quad (3)$$

where σ_y^2 is variance of y (not ξ), and the $\frac{1}{2\sigma_y^2}$ plays the role of a constant normalising the power spectrum. The κ is defined as:

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{2\omega_k} \tan^{-1} \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \sin 2\omega_k t_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \cos 2\omega_k t_i} \right]. \quad (4)$$

The bandwidth of the Lomb-Scargle method is not as restricted as in the case of the Discrete Fourier Transform due to irregular sampling. Mudelsee (2009) highlights the difficulty of selecting the highest frequency, and suggests extending the frequency range to 110% of the Nyquist critical frequency.

2.2 Spectra of the time domain method

The Harmonic Regression (Vanicek, 1969) method estimates Fourier coefficients in Equation 1 through minimising the sum of squared error terms $\sum \xi_i^2$. It can incorporate any functional form of a trend, is not bounded by minimum or maximum frequency, nor frequency resolution (Vanicek, 1969). However the parameter k determining the number of cyclical components in the model needs to be kept low, as the model has a tendency to overfit in high dimensional problems. The power spectrum is estimated as usual using Equation 2.

2.3 Frequency identification methods

Scargle (1982) proved that the normalised Lomb-Scargle spectrum follows an exponential distribution with mean 1, and can be tested with its quantile function as follows:

$$F^{-1}(\alpha^*) = -\log(1 - (1 - \alpha^*)^{1/k}) \quad (5)$$

indicating a level above which peaks in the spectrum are significant at the α^* level.

The REDFIT methodology is based on the Lomb-Scargle algorithm (Equation 3; Schulz & Mudelsee, 2002), it applies a different approach to frequency identification. REDFIT assumes that the null hypothesis for a stochastic process exhibits a continuous decrease of spectral amplitude with increasing frequency, and models that behaviour with the continuous time AR(1)

process (Mudelsee, 2002):

$$y(t_i) = \exp\left(-\frac{t_i - t_{i-1}}{\tau}\right) y(t_{i-1}) + \xi_i \quad (6)$$

where:

- τ is the time persistence scaling factor;
- ξ_i is the heteroscedastic random component distributed as $\xi_i \sim N\left(0, 1 - \exp\left(-2\frac{t_i - t_{i-1}}{\tau}\right)\right)$.

Under this assumption the confidence intervals of the AR(1) model, obtained via Monte Carlo simulation and being equivalent of the χ^2 multiple frequency test, serve as an indicator of significant frequencies in the data spectrum. The REDFIT methodology (Schulz & Mudelsee, 2002) after Thompson (1990) suggests applying a false-alarm level G via:

$$G = \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^*}\right) \times 100\% \quad (7)$$

where n^* is the number of data points in each (possibly overlapping) segment of the data (Mudelsee, 2009). Other approaches to setting the false-alarm also exist e.g. Siegel's test (Siegel, 1980). The currently available version of the REDFIT package (ver 38e) does not support custom false-alarm levels, and instead provides results for 80%, 90%, 95%, and 99% significance levels.

Applying the AR(1) model for the purpose of identifying 'significant' frequencies has a number of issues:

- It limits applicability of the REDFIT methodology to the cases where AR(1) noise is the only valid competitor to full frequency behaviour, thus disregarding the possibility of intermediate complexity models;
- The time persistence parameter τ of the AR(1) model, upon which the shape of the spectrum strongly depends, is treated as fixed. In fact it is estimated from the data as $\hat{\tau}$ and is thus a random variable. Consequently there may be considerable uncertainty over the level of the spectrum due to the epistemic uncertainty in τ .

The REDFIT package also allows applying one of 5 different window functions, namely: Rectangular, Welch, Hanning, Triangular and Blackman-Harris (Schulz & Mudelsee, 2010) to reduce

impact of spectral leakage. Although reduction of spectral leakage is a very desired effect, the choice of a window function influences shape of spectral densities and amplitudes of spectral peaks (Trauth, 2015)¹. Using time-uncertain water table records from Dear Island and Slieveanorra we demonstrate in our case study and in Appendix A that the choice of different window functions influences the results of hypothesis testing in the REDFIT model.

2.4 Time uncertainty

Estimating the timing of observations from palaeoclimatic data is typically completed via dating methods (e.g. radiocarbon; Bowman, 1990). However incorporating the time uncertainty that arises from such methods is very challenging and so often ignored (e.g. Essefi, Mefteh, Medhioub, & Yaich, 2014; Swindles, Patterson, Roe, & Galloway, 2014). Traditional methods of frequency analysis do not account for the uncertainty in time as the problem is not embedded within the Lomb-Scargle and harmonic regression models. In Section 4 we demonstrate that ignoring time uncertainty can have grave implications for frequency identification.

One method to incorporate time uncertainty (as used by Mudelsee et al., 2009) is to model timescale errors parametrically to determine upper levels of the AR(1) spectrum and estimate uncertainty of spectral peaks. Another method is to jitter time estimates multiple times outside of a frequency model, evaluate spectral densities for each realization and merge the results (Rhines & Huybers, 2011).

Our alternative approach is to include time uncertainty directly through the prior distribution, corresponding to a standard Errors-In-Variables structure (e.g. Dey, Ghosh, & Mallick, 2000). We present this in the next section.

3 Bayesian Frequency Selection

In this section we outline our main contribution; a model-based, Bayesian approach to frequency identification. We term the model we use as *Bayesian Frequency Selection* (BFS); it can be

¹the reference describes application of window functions in evenly sampled time series, we did not find any publications discussing influence of window functions on frequency identification in the domain of time-uncertain time series

considered part of the class of shrinkage and selection methods which aim to choose a subset of predictors (here frequencies) as being important for explaining the variability in the response. Many other shrinkage and selection methods have been proposed (e.g, Lasso, Ridge regression etc., for a more complete list see Hastie, Tibshirani, & Friedman, 2009), though application to the problem of frequency selection is limited. A critical assumption of such models, which we follow here, is that a large number of frequencies included in, e.g. the harmonic regression model, are negligible so that their regression coefficients β_j and γ_j are all 0. In a Bayesian context, many of the aforementioned shrinkage models do not shrink parameter values fully to zero (Hastie et al., 2009). In our BFS model, we use a version of Bayesian shrinkage which does set parameters at 0, following the method of George and McCulloch (1993, 1997).

Our proposal is to apply the BFS to frequency identification by introducing indicator variables I_j into Equation 1. The indicator variables take the value 0 or 1 with a predefined prior Bernoulli distribution so that $I_j \sim \text{Bernoulli}(q)$ where q indicates the probability that frequency j is important in explaining the variability in the response (Kuo & Mallick, 1988). In particular, we force the indicator variables I_j to assume the same values for both sine and cosine terms at each particular frequency jointly. We thus adapt Equation 1 slightly to give:

$$y(t_i) = g(t_i) + \sum_{j=1}^k I_j \beta_j \cos(2\pi f_j t_i) + \sum_{j=1}^k I_j \gamma_j \sin(2\pi f_j t_i) + \xi_i \quad (8)$$

A key aspect is that we can include external information about the parameters (e.g. from other data sources) by specifying their prior probability distributions. In the context of frequency analysis, we aim to obtain the posterior distribution of the parameters which govern the cyclical components, namely β_j and γ_j . The central contribution of our approach is the specification of a model through which the important frequencies are chosen automatically.

Through our BFS approach we can still specify the total number of frequencies k to be large, and let the inference procedure (constrained by a prior distribution) choose the number of important frequencies. The lack of such a restriction in k allows us to analyse a very wide spectra in search of important components. The harmonic regression model in many such cases would fail to recognise the true pattern, and typically would identify too many frequencies.

Another benefit of our proposal is that within this framework we can incorporate any functional form of trend $g(t_i)$, as appropriate to the problem at hand. In contrast the frequency domain methods are not designed to cope with trends. Spectra of time series containing such components are distorted and thus traditionally it has been necessary to remove them (Mudelsee, 2009). This can cause problems when low frequency components compete with the trend to explain variability.

In our application we model the trend component $g(t_i)$ as a linear combination of polynomial basis functions. We set the maximum degree to be 3. This is of course an arbitrary choice but values higher than this would induce their own cyclical behaviour and so compete directly with the frequency component. The third degree polynomial term will have at most one complete cycle across the time support of the data and so the value of 3 seems appropriate. Furthermore, for computational purposes we find it convenient to express Equation 8 in matrix form:

$$Y = X\alpha + Z_1 I\beta + Z_2 I\gamma + \xi \quad (9)$$

where:

- Y is the $n \times 1$ column vector of observed $y(t_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ values;
- X is the $n \times (l + 1)$ standardized design matrix of the constant and trend components, where l is number of trend components in a polynomial basis. Thus the i, j^{th} element of X is $t_i^{*,j-1} = \left(\frac{t_i - \bar{t}}{\bar{s}_t} \right)^{j-1}$, where \bar{t} is mean of means of timings of observations and \bar{s}_t is mean of standard deviations of timings of observations - both are given as data. The standardization enables easier implementation of non informative priors;
- α is the $(l + 1) \times 1$ column vector of the constant and trend parameters;
- Z_1 and Z_2 are the $n \times k$ matrices of cosine (Z_1) and sine (Z_2) terms. The i, j^{th} element of Z_1 is $\cos(2\pi f_j t_i)$, and for Z_2 is $\sin(2\pi f_j t_i)$;
- I is a $k \times k$ diagonal matrix of indicator variables with elements $I_j = 1$ or $I_j = 0$ on the diagonal and zeros on all off-diagonals (note we use J rather than I for the identity matrix);

- β and γ are $k \times 1$ vectors of parameters of the cosine (β) and sine (γ) terms;
- ξ is $n \times 1$ is vector of the residual error terms with $\xi \sim N(0, \sigma^2 J)$. This is white noise Gaussian covariance matrix.

Taken together we have parameters $\theta = \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \sigma^2, I, q\}$ and data D containing the design matrices $D = \{Y, X, Z_1, Z_2\}$. Note that the frequencies are included in the model via the matrices Z_1 and Z_2 . Henceforth in describing the model we always use this form of the notation, discarding the earlier form from Equation 1 since it is more relevant to the explanation of the BFS model.

3.1 Prior distributions

We now turn our attention to the choice of prior distributions for unknown parameters. Where possible, informative priors should be used to guide the values of these, as in most normal scientific experiments. Where not possible, we can use vague or weakly informative priors to enable valid model fits whilst avoiding undue influence on the identification of frequencies. The parameter that is most sensitive to prior choice is that of I_j and its Bernoulli associated probability q . We propose several choices:

- In cases where there is no knowledge whatsoever about q we might assume a vague prior, for example that q is equally likely to take any value from 0 – 100%, so that the prior distribution is $q \sim U(0, 1)$;
- In cases where the distribution of the parameter q requires more weight towards a point between 0 – 100% one could assume the Beta prior distribution so that $q \sim Be(\alpha^*, \beta^*)$;
- In cases where there is known to be a small number of important frequencies we might re-define $q = \frac{m}{k}$ where m is the number of important frequencies and k is the total number of frequencies (as in Equation 8) set to $k = \frac{n \times ofac}{2}$, where the *ofac* parameter is the oversampling factor, by default *ofac* = 1. The value of m can then be fixed or given a prior. For example, if there are estimated to be a maximum of γ important frequencies then e.g. $m \sim DU(0, \gamma)$ where DU is the discrete uniform distribution. By default we set the parameter $\gamma = 10$.

For the remainder of the paper we propose to use the latter formulation as it most closely matches the real world behaviour we hope to model.

For the parameters associated with the trend and frequency components we use vague priors:

$$\alpha \sim N(0, \sigma_\alpha^2 J), \beta \sim N(0, \sigma_\beta^2 J), \gamma \sim N(0, \sigma_\gamma^2 J) \quad (10)$$

where the prior variances are all fixed at large values. For the residual variance we use the standard reference prior:

$$\sigma_\xi^2 \sim IG(e^*, f^*) \quad (11)$$

where e^* and f^* are set to small values.

To include time uncertainty, we simply add an extra layer to the model so that θ now includes t_i for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and D similarly includes $\mu_{t_i}, \sigma_{t_i}^2$. We write t as the full set of all unknown true times and μ_t, σ_t^2 as the set of means and variances respectively. The prior distribution is:

$$t_i | \mu_{t_i}, \sigma_{t_i}^2 \sim TN_{t_{j-1}}^{t_{j+1}}(\mu_{t_i}, \sigma_{t_i}^2) \quad (12)$$

Where:

- t_i is the true and unknown age of observation i bounded at the extreme ends - t_0 and t_{n+1} set to very small and very large values respectively;
- μ_{t_i} is the mean age of observation i estimated from a chronology model;
- $\sigma_{t_i}^2$ is the variance of the age of observation i , estimated at the same time as μ_{t_i} .

The extra computational issue is that now the matrices Z_1 and Z_2 need to be changed for each new realisation of t_j . However, this overhead is the necessary price to be paid for including time uncertainty.

A more complete model would use a posterior samples from Bchron, where each set of samples are not normally distributed but remain monotonically consistent. We found such an approach impossible to implement without computational challenges and leave this for future research.

In practice these estimated ages are not normally distributed but Parnell and Gehrels (2015) have shown that, in reasonable size data sets, this difference is unimportant in the final model predictions. In our practical application we use the chronology model Bchron (Haslett & Parnell, 2008) to obtain the posterior distribution of timing from each layer. In the next step we approximate those distributions by Gaussian distributions by calculating the pairs $\mu_{t_i}, \sigma_{t_i}^2$. In the model we impose truncation on the approximated realizations as per Equation 12.

3.2 Model fitting

Our full posterior distribution is thus:

$$p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \sigma^2, I, q, t, m | Y, X, Z_1, Z_2, \mu_t, \sigma_t^2) \quad (13)$$

which is separated into likelihood and prior respectively as:

$$p(Y|X, Z_1, Z_2, t, \sigma^2, \alpha, \beta, \gamma) \times p(\alpha) p(\beta) p(\gamma) p(\sigma^2) p(I|q) p(q|m) p(m) p(t|\mu_t, \sigma_t^2) \quad (14)$$

An alternative way to display the model fit is in the form of a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG; Figure 1) which shows the relations between parameters and data, and also shows the conditional independencies.

3.2.1 Sampling from the posterior distribution

We use the JAGS package (Plummer, 2017) for the purpose of obtaining posterior distributions of the parameters. It is now a standard method in the Bayesian modelling toolbox which works well even in high dimensional settings such as ours. To provide insight into implementation of the BFS model we enclose our JAGS code in Appendix B.

The package uses number of algorithms to generate samples from posterior distributions - Gibbs sampling, Slice sampling, Adaptive Rejection sampling and Metropolis-Hastings (Plummer, 2017). The sampling algorithm starts with the definition of the full posterior (Equation 13) and, from some initial values of the parameters used to start the iterative process, proceeds




Figure 1: Directed Acyclic Graph of our Bayesian Frequency Selection model. Circles correspond to parameters to be estimated, whilst squares indicate data. Arrows indicate the direction of information flow.

by updating the parameters either individually or in block fashion. After a suitable period (known as the burn-in period) a set number of the parameter values are stored and thinned out to remove autocorrelation. For our algorithm we keep 2500 samples of the parameters from the posterior, and remove 1500 burn-in samples. We check convergence using the standard Brooks-Gelman-Rubin diagnostic (Brooks & Gelman, 1998; Gelman & Rubin, 1992) to ensure the parameter estimates are stable.

3.2.2 Posterior post-hoc calculations

Upon obtaining samples from the posterior distribution, we make inferences about the parameters of interest. In our case the parameters of interest are that of the sine and cosine coefficients

β_j and γ_j respectively, and their relevant indicator variables I_j . From these values we create two important quantities. The first is our weighted Power Spectrum created as a part of the BFS methodology:

$$P_{BFS}(f_j) = \frac{I_j\beta_j^2 + I_j\gamma_j^2}{2} \quad (15)$$

which we can now estimate with uncertainty for all frequencies as we have full access to the posterior distribution of the parameters. The second is the probability of a frequency at f_j which we can calculate from the posterior mean of I_j . A high value (i.e. close to 1) indicates a likely important frequency. We recommend researchers tailor their interpretation to the specific problem at hand, and use the tools of prior distributions to create a bespoke version of their analysis. In situations where we observe small posterior means of I_j and wide posterior intervals for β_j and γ_j , we would still argue that such frequencies are unimportant. Aside from our two main outputs, we also have access to all the posterior samples of the other parameters. We can thus determine the degree to which the trend components are important through α , assess the model fit via σ^2 (where small σ^2 indicates good model fit), or look at the posterior estimates of timing from t .

3.2.3 Model Cross-Validation

We assess predictive performance of the model by applying K -fold Cross-Validation. This allows us to determine the predictive fit of the model on data which has not been used as part of the fitting process, and thus provides a much harsher test of model performance. We use standard 5-fold cross validation even though our data are time series. Such an approach has been validated by Bergmeir and Benitez (2012).

In the presence of time uncertainty, the observations are of course not observed at known time points, so out-of-sample performance may be adversely affected, even when the model is identified correctly. In order to combat this problem and obtain a more accurate picture of Cross-Validation performance we adjust the timing Equation 12) of the data points by the output from our Bayesian model, namely the estimates of the t_i parameters. By doing so we attempt to predict the true timing of actual observations instead of predicting timing that a certain dating methodology provides. In our simulated data sets this approach yields fairer out-of-sample performance giving a clearer picture of the model validation performance under

time uncertainty.

4 Accuracy of REDFIT and Bayesian Frequency Selection methods

In this section we conduct a simulation experiment where we create 110 simulated data sets (100 with frequency behaviour and 10 without) of varying complexities and fit both our BFS and the REDFIT model. Our aim is to see which of the models identifies the correct frequencies. Since both methods provide confidence levels about the frequencies (BFS via the posteriors of I_j ; REDFIT via the significance level) we use Receiver Operator Characteristic Curves (ROC; Swets, 1996) to contrast their performance.

4.1 Simulation and testing methodology

We test both methods using 110 simulated time-uncertain data sets with randomly generated:

- Number of observations $N \sim DU(100, 150)$;
- 100 data sets with number of frequencies in the signal $k \sim DU(1, 6)$ randomly assigned to either sine or cosine coefficients with amplitudes $\beta_j = \gamma_l = 10$, and 10 data sets where $k = 0$;
- Residual error term $\xi_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$, where $\sigma \sim U(2, 30)$;
- Uniformly distributed true timing of observations $t_{true,1:N} \sim U(0, 100)$, sorted in ascending order to model non-overlapping attribute of palaeoclimate time series;
- Normally distributed timing of observations $t_{observed_i} \sim N(t_{true_i}, \sigma_{observed}^2)$, where $\sigma_{observed} \sim (0.2, 2.5)$ (note $\mu(dt_{observed}) \approx 0.8$); realizations are sorted in ascending order.

The objective of this specification is to mimic basic attributes of palaeoclimate time series, which demonstrate substantial variety in frequency and noise behaviour.

In conducting our tests of both frequency identification methods we apply the same randomly generated 110 simulated time-uncertain time series to both methods. We use default settings in

REDFIT and run 5,000 simulations using the BFS method with a burn-in of 20%. We identify peaks above specified significance levels in the results obtained with REDFIT and probability levels in the BFS method as frequencies selected by those methods. Next, we compare those against the true frequencies in all data sets.

In identifying true positives (or false negatives) we accept the results if the selected frequencies are in (or are outside) of a narrow range of ± 1 frequency f_j in frequency vectors generated with the highest resolution obtained without oversampling in the Nyquist range. We define this range to avoid misclassifications caused by frequency discretization and frequency leakage.

For the purpose of this test we apply the default oversampling setting (ofac) of the REDFIT method $ofac_{REDFIT} = 4$, as it is commonly used by researchers. We apply no oversampling in the BFS method $ofac_{BFS} = 1$ since none is required and to do so would slow the model down considerably. To make a fair comparison between the two methods, and compare the results using the same range of frequency buckets, we define them as follow: let f_j be a frequency in discrete frequency vectors generated by either of the methods that is the closest to the true frequency f_k , then the range of frequency buckets containing true frequency is $r_j \subset [f_{j-ofac}, f_{j+ofac}]$. This should enable fair comparison despite the differences in oversampling between the methods.

In the next step we plot ROC curve (Figure 2) for the BFS method and add empirical true positive and false positive rates for the only four significance levels available in REDFIT (99%, 95%, 90%, 80%). For REDFIT this involves some degree of linear interpolation.

4.2 Results from the simulation experiment

The area under ROC curve generated by the BFS method is 86%, and given the extreme characteristics of the generated time-uncertain time series we asses this result as very good. We cannot generate the entire area under ROC curve using REDFIT, the available four points plotted in Figure 2 give a reference for comparison of the performances with the area under the ROC curve of 59%. It seems unlikely that, even if other significance levels were available to




Figure 2: ROC curves for BFS and REDFIT methods based on 110 simulated data sets.

complete the full curve, that the area under the ROC curve for REDFIT would approach that of the BFS method. In our view the BFS method outperforms REDFIT in terms of frequency identification. It also allows for applying a number of diagnostics supporting validation (cross-validation, convergence diagnostics etc.).

5 Frequency identification of water table records from mid- to late- Holocene

In this section we contrast results obtained via REDFIT with those of the BFS method using as an example analysis of Holocene water table records extracted from two closely located ombrotrophic peatlands in Northern Ireland - Dead Island and Slieveanorra, representing respectively lowland and upland perspectives (Swindles et al., 2014). A plot of the data is shown in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Water Table records observed in Dead Island and Slieveanorra in Northern Ireland.

Prior to conducting frequency analysis we use Bchron (Haslett & Parnell, 2008) to construct a chronology for the sites in question, utilising the radiocarbon dates and their associated depths to produce estimated ages at all depths at which the proxy is measured. The resulting chronologies for the two cores are shown in Figure 4. Note that in the original paper (Swindles et al., 2014) a different chronology construction was used.




Figure 4: Uncertainty surrounding the time estimates using Bchron. Gray bars represent one sigma (σ_{t_i}) errors surrounding the expected timing of observations μ_{t_i} .

5.1 REDFIT

We de-trend the records from Slieveanorra using a 3^{rd} degree polynomial regression, and keep records from Dead Island unchanged as their appears to be no clear trend. We apply the default setting of the REDFIT version 38e utilizing the rectangular window and set the parameter $ofac = 4$ (typical values range from 2 to 4 as per Schulz & Mudelsee, 2010). A plot of the periodogram is shown in Figure 5, with significant levels 90%, 95%, and 99%.

At Dead Island, the REDFIT spectrum suggests 12 significant frequencies at the 99% level existing above the frequency $f = 0.0068$. At 95% and 90% it identifies 21 and 25 frequencies respectively. The significance level suggested by Thompson (1990) corresponds to 98.7%. At Slieveanorra the REDFIT spectrum at the 99% level does not detect any significant frequencies. At the 95% and 90% significance levels it identifies 4 and 5 significant frequencies respectively. The significance level suggested by Thompson (1990) corresponds to 98.2%. We compare the frequencies chosen by the different methods in more detail in Section 5.3.

We note that detection of spectral peaks within the REDFIT framework may depend upon the chosen window function. We summarize the results of applying other window functions

available in the REDFIT package to the records presented in our case studies in Appendix A.




Figure 5: REDFIT: spectra of water table records observed in Dead Island and Slieveanorra in Northern Ireland.

5.2 Bayesian Frequency Selection

We conduct the BFS analysis on the two cores. We use a cubic trend for both sites, though no de-trending is required as this is incorporated as part of the model fitting process. We use the exact same prior distributions as for the simulated example of the previous section. However, we set the maximum number of frequencies to give $k_{DeadIsland} = 75$ and $k_{Slieveanorra} = 56$ over the Nyquist range. We use JAGS to obtain posterior samples and check convergence as previously described.

The periodogram for the BFS method applied to Dead Island is shown in Figure 6. The model selects three clear frequencies with large power estimates at $f_1 = 0.00045$, $f_2 = 0.00067$, and $f_3 = 0.0016$ with the probability of indicators approaching 100% each. The equivalents in years are 2241, 1494, 640 year cycles. It also selects two less important frequencies $f_4 = 0.00759$ and $f_5 = 0.00138$ with median power equal to zero, wide confidence intervals and the probability of indicators equal to 24% and 10% respectively. The equivalents in years are 132 and 72 year cycles. Figure 7 shows 5-fold cross-validation performance for the Dead Island model. The out of sample performance seems to indicate a good fit of the model to the data.




Figure 6: BFS: Dead Island periodogram with confidence intervals at 99% in the upper part, and probability indicator plot on the lower part. The BFS method identifies three significant frequencies approaching 100% and two less important frequencies with 24% and 10% of inclusion.

The periodogram of the Slieveanorra water table record is shown in Figure 8. The method selected two relatively unimportant frequencies $f_1 = 0.0024$ and $f_2 = 0.0026$ being the equivalent of a 416 and 381 year cycles respectively, with the median power estimates of $P_{f_1} = P_{f_2} = 0$ and wide confidence intervals. The probabilities of those frequencies are estimated at 38% and 8% so there is substantial doubt as to the importance of those signals. The 5-fold cross validation is shown in Figure 9 is noticeably worse than that of Dead Island and perhaps indicates a lack of detectable frequency behaviour for this site.




Figure 7: BFS: Dead Island 5-fold cross validation shows good fit of the model given the two sources of uncertainties, and good predictive one step out-of-sample performance. The estimated value of the $pseudo R^2=0.60$ confirms a good fit of the model and also reflects the substantial amount of noise in the data.




Figure 8: BFS: Slieveanorra periodogram with confidence intervals at 99% in the upper part, and probability indicator plot in the lower part. Frequencies selected by the method are unimportant.




Figure 9: BFS: Slieveanorra 5-fold cross validation. This shows a relatively poor fit of the model to the in sample and out of sample predictions.

5.3 Comparison of selected frequencies

The frequencies selected by the REDFIT and the BFS methods are largely inconsistent for the water table records in Dead Island and Slieveanorra. The inconsistency might be expected for Slieveanorra since neither method indicates strong frequency behaviour (Table 2), at Dead Island the BFS method picks up more lower frequency behaviour whilst REDFIT identifies many more higher frequency terms (Table 1). In particular, the REDFIT version we use does not take into account time uncertainty, which may be root cause of the difference in selected frequencies. We note that Swindles et al. (2014) found the same issues when comparing REDFIT with Lomb-Scargle.

Dead Island	REDFIT			BFS
Cycle	90%	95%	99%	Probability
2,241	-	-	-	100%
1,630	✓	✓	-	-
1,494	-	-	-	100%
640	-	-	-	100%
212	✓	-	-	-
190	✓	✓	-	-
177	✓	-	-	-
147	✓	✓	✓	-
132	✓	✓	✓	24%
129	✓	-	-	-
120	✓	✓	✓	-
116	✓	✓	-	-
115	✓	✓	-	-
110	✓	✓	✓	-
101	✓	✓	✓	-
97	✓	✓	✓	-
90	✓	✓	-	-
86	✓	✓	✓	-
83	✓	✓	-	-
81	✓	✓	-	-
77	✓	✓	✓	-
75	✓	✓	✓	-
72	✓	✓	✓	10%
70	✓	-	-	-
68	✓	✓	✓	-
65	✓	✓	-	-
64	✓	✓	✓	-
63	✓	✓	-	-

Table 1: Significant frequencies chosen by REDFIT vs high probability frequencies chosen by BFS for the Dead Island site.

SI	REDFIT			BFS
Cycle	90%	95%	99%	Probability
1,681	✓	-	-	-
474	✓	-	-	-
416	✓	✓	-	34%
381	✓	✓	-	7%
369	✓	✓	-	-
325	✓	✓	-	-
150	✓	✓	-	-
119	✓	-	-	-

Table 2: Significant frequencies chosen by REDFIT vs high probability frequencies chosen by BFS for the Slieveanorra site.

6 Conclusions

Our Bayesian Frequency Selection method introduces a novel approach to the problem of frequency identification in time-uncertain series as well as series with known timing of observations. In contrast with the traditional methods of frequency analysis the BFS model allows us to incorporate output from a chronology model, facilitating more realistic and accurate modelling of the uncertainties in the data. As we have shown, this can have a strong impact on the conclusions drawn from analysis in the frequency domain. In our simulated examples we demonstrated that treating uncertain timing of observations as exact, and therefore neglecting the uncertainty attribute, may result in misidentification of true frequency patterns.

Aside from dealing with time uncertainty, the Bayesian framework allows us to answer direct questions of interest, such as ‘what is the probability that this frequency exists given the current data?’. It allows us to move away from null hypothesis significance testing where, given a large enough data set, all frequencies will be selected as significant. Furthermore, given full access to a posterior distribution, we can create posterior uncertainty intervals for e.g. a periodogram, or any other desired quantity.

For simulated data with uncertain timings, the BFS method seems to perform better than traditional methods. It seems to be able to identify the correct frequencies more often, and seems less prone to over-fitting. Most interestingly, though, is the comparison of real data sets where, at least for Dead Island, the results from BFS conflict strongly with that of REDFIT. It seems appropriate that, at the very least, all such methods should provide out of sample performance metrics for each site, such as that we provide in e.g. Figure 9.

The BFS model, being a standard Bayesian model, allows for many possibilities for extension. It would be reasonably simple to apply the model in a generalised linear modelling framework for e.g. pollen counts that might be Poisson distributed. Other avenues for further research include the possibility of incorporating the chronology model within the BFS model, so as jointly to estimate sedimentation rates and frequency behaviour. A broader challenge would be to extend to dynamic frequencies under time uncertainty, though identifying and validating models here will be exceedingly tricky.

References

- Bergmeir, C., & Benitez, J. (2012). On the use of cross-validation for time series predictor evaluation. *Information Sciences*, 191, 192–216.
- Bond, G., Showers, W., Cheseby, M., Lotti, R., Almasi, P., deMenocal, P., . . . Bonani, G. (1997). A pervasive millennial-scale cycle in North Atlantic Holocene and glacial climates. *Science*, 278, 1257–1266.
- Bowman, S. (1990). *Radiocarbon dating*. University of California Press.
- Brooks, S., & Gelman, A. (1998). General methods for monitoring convergence of iterative simulations. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 7, 434–455.
- Dey, D., Ghosh, S., & Mallick, B. (2000). *Generalized linear models: A Bayesian perspective*. Dekker.
- Essefi, E., Mefteh, S., Medhioub, M., & Yaich, C. (2014). Magnetic study of the heated and unheated sedimentary fillings of Sebkha Mhabeul, Southeast Tunisia: A geophysical method for paleoclimatic investigation and tephrochronological dating. *International Journal of Geophysics*, 2014, 1–7.
- Gelman, A., & Rubin, D. (1992). Inference from iterative simulation using multiple sequences. *Statistical Science*, 7, 457–511.
- George, E., & McCulloch, R. (1993). Variable selection via Gibbs sampling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 88, 881–889.
- George, E., & McCulloch, R. (1997). Approaches for Bayesian variable selection. *Statistica Sinica*, 7, 339–373.
- Gupta, H., Mehra, R., & Batan, S. (2013). Power spectrum estimation using Welch method for various window techniques. *IJSRET*, 2, 389–392.
- Haslett, J., & Parnell, A. (2008). A simple monotone process with application to radiocarbon-dated depth chronologies. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series C (Applied Statistics)*, 57, 399–418.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., & Friedman, J. (2009). *The elements of statistical learning*. Springer.
- Hays, J., Imbrie, J., & Shackleton, N. (1976). Variations in the Earth’s orbit: Pacemaker

- of the Ice Ages. *Science*, *194*, 1121–1132.
- Kuo, L., & Mallick, B. (1988). Variable selection for regression models. *Sankhya: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series B*, *60*, 65–81.
- Lomb, N. (1976). Least-squares frequency analysis of unequally spaced data. *Astrophysics and Space Science*, *39*, 447–462.
- Mudelsee, M. (2009). *Climate time series analysis, classical statistical and bootstrap methods*. Springer.
- Mudelsee, M., Scholz, D., Rothlisberger, R., Fleitmann, D., Mangini, A., & Wolff, E. (2009). Climate spectrum estimation in the presence of timescale errors. *Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics*, *16*, 43–56.
- Mudelsee, M. (2002). TAUEST: a computer program for estimating persistence in unevenly spaced weather/climate time series. *Computers & Geosciences*, *28*, 69–72.
- Parnell, A., & Gehrels, R. (2015). Using chronological models in late Holocene sea level reconstructions from salt marsh sediments - handbook of sea level research. In (chap. 32). Wiley.
- Plummer, M. (2017). Jags version 4.3.0 user manual [Computer software manual]. Retrieved from sourceforge.net/projects/mcmc-jags/files/Manuals/4.x/
- Rhines, A., & Huybers, P. (2011). Estimation of spectral power laws in time uncertain series of data with application to the Greenland Ice Sheet Project 2 $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ record. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *116*, 1–9.
- Scargle, J. (1982). Studies in astronomical time series analysis. ii - statistical aspects of spectral analysis of unevenly spaced data. *Astrophysical Journal*, *263*, 835–853.
- Scargle, J. (1989). Studies in astronomical time series analysis. iii. Fourier transforms, autocorrelation functions, and cross-correlation functions of unevenly spaced data. *Astrophysical Journal*, *343*, 874–887.
- Schulz, M., & Mudelsee, M. (2002). REDFIT: Estimating red-noise spectra directly from unevenly spaced paleoclimatic time series. *Computers & Geosciences*, *28*, 421–426.

- Schulz, M., & Mudelsee, M. (2010). REDFIT 3.8e. Estimating red-noise spectra directly from unevenly spaced paleoclimatic time series [Computer software manual]. Retrieved from www.geo.uni-bremen.de/geomod/staff/mschulz/software/redfit38e.zip
- Siegel, A. (1980). Testing for periodicity in a time-series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 75, 345–348.
- Swets, J. (1996). *Signal detection theory and ROC analysis in psychology and diagnostics*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Swindles, G., Patterson, T., Roe, H., & Galloway, J. (2014). Evaluating periodicities in peat-based climate proxy records. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 41, 94–103.
- Thompson, D. (1990). Time series analysis of holocene climate data. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 330, 601–616.
- Trauth, M. (2015). *Matlab® Recipes for earth sciences*. Springer.
- Vanicek, P. (1969). Approximate spectral analysis by least-squares fit. Successive spectral analysis. *Astrophysics and Space Science*, 4, 387–391.
- Warner, N., & Domack, E. (2002). Millennial- to decadal-scale paleoenvironmental change during the holocene in the Palmer Deep, Antarctica, as recorded by particle size analysis. *Paleoceanography*, 17, PAL 5-1PAL 5-14.

A Influence of applying different window functions on frequency selection in the REDFIT framework

As noted in Section 2.3 the choice of a window function within the REDFIT framework may influence the results of hypothesis’ testing. We extend the REDFIT analysis presented in our case study of the water table records from Dead Island and Slieveanorra in Northern Ireland (Section 5) and apply the remaining window functions available in this package. We summarize the results by contrasting counts of significant peaks above 90%, 95%, and 99% credible intervals in Table 3.




Figure 10: REDFIT: spectra of water table records observed in Dead Island in Northern Ireland generated using four different window functions.

The obtained results are inconsistent. It is hard to choose a cut-off point or window method which works well. We were also unable to find any wider research determining the choice of a window function in the domain of time uncertainty. We noticed that the Welch window is generally preferred (Gupta, Mehra, & Batan, 2013) in the domain of evenly spaced data.




Figure 11: REDFIT: spectra of water table records observed in Slieveanorra in Northern Ireland generated using four different window functions.

Window	Dead Island			Slieveanorra		
	90%	95%	99%	90%	95%	99%
Welch	13	12	6	5	3	-
Hanning	11	9	3	5	4	-
Triangular	12	10	3	4	3	-
Blackman-Harris	9	7	2	3	3	-
Rectangular	25	21	12	7	4	-

Table 3: Summary of significant frequencies selected by the REDFIT method using different window functions. Results show lack of consistency in case of the records from Dead Island, and consistency in case of the records from Slieveanorra.

B Bayesian Frequency Selection - the JAGS code

We present the JAGS code of our implementation of the BFS model used in this research.

```
model {  
  for(i in 1 : n) {  
    y[i] ~ dnorm(mu[i], precision)  
    mu[i] <- const + alpha1 * ti.sim.st[i] + alpha2 * ti.sim.st[i]^2 +  
      alpha3 * ti.sim.st[i]^3 + inprod(X[i,], IBeta)  
  }  
  for(j in 1 : (2 * n.frequencies)) {  
    beta[j] ~ dnorm(0, 0.01)  
  }  
  for(j in 1 : n.frequencies) {  
    M[j] ~ dunif(0, m)  
    Ind[j] ~ dbern(M[j] / n.frequencies)  
    IBeta[j] <- Ind[j] * beta[j]  
    Ind[j + n.frequencies] <- Ind[j]  
    IBeta[j + n.frequencies] <- Ind[j + n.frequencies] *  
      beta[j + n.frequencies]  
  }  
  for(i in 1 : n) {  
    for(j in 1:n.frequencies) {  
      X[i,j] <- sin(2 * pi * ti.sim[i] * frequencies[j])  
    }  
    for(j in (n.frequencies + 1) : (2 * n.frequencies)) {  
      X[i,j] <- cos(2 * pi * ti.sim[i] *  
        frequencies[j - n.frequencies])  
    }  
  }  
  for (i in 1 : n) {  
    ti.sim.tmp[i] ~ dnorm(ti.mu[i], 1 / ti.sd[i]^2)
```

```

    }
ti.sim <- sort(ti.sim.tmp)
ti.sim.st <- (ti.sim-ti.mu.mu)/ti.mu.sd
const ~ dnorm(const.mean, const.prec)
precision ~ dgamma(0.01, 0.01)
alpha1 ~ dnorm(0, 0.01)
alpha2 ~ dnorm(0, 0.01)
alpha3 ~ dnorm(0, 0.01)}

```

Where:

- *const* is the constant value;
- *alpha1*, *alpha2* and *alpha3* are the coefficients of polynomial regression;
- *beta* is the vector of Fourier coefficients of cosine and sine terms;
- *Ind* is the vector of indicator variables;
- *IBeta* is the vector of products of Fourier coefficients and indicator variables;
- *X* is the matrix of sine and cosine terms;
- *ti.mu* is the vector of estimated timing of observations;
- *ti.mu.mu* is the mean of *ti.mu*;
- *ti.mu.sd* is the standard deviation of *ti.mu*;
- *ti.sim.tmp* is the vector of simulated estimates of timing of observations;
- *ti.sim* is truncated *ti.sim.tmp*;
- *ti.sim.st* is standardized *ti.sim.tmp*;
- *m* is the expected maximum number of frequencies in the data;
- *frequencies* is the vector of frequencies;
- *n.frequencies* is the number of frequencies.